

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**
10

11 ARASH HASHEMI,
12 Plaintiff(s),

Case No.: 2:19-cv-00212-RFB-NJK

13 v.

ORDER

14 PROGRESSIVE NORTHERN INSURANCE
15 COMPANY,
16 Defendant(s).

17 Pending before the Court is a Stipulated Protective Order, which the Court approved to
18 facilitate discovery in this case. This order reminds counsel that there is a presumption of public
19 access to judicial files and records. A party seeking to file a confidential document under seal
20 must file a motion to seal and must comply with the Ninth Circuit's directives in *Kamakana v. City*
21 *and County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172 (9th Cir. 2006).

22 The Court has adopted electronic filing procedures. Attorneys must file documents under
23 seal using the Court's electronic filing procedures. *See* Local Rule IA 10-5. Papers filed with the
24 Court under seal must be accompanied with a concurrently-filed motion for leave to file those
25 documents under seal. *See* Local Rule IA 10-5(a).

26 The Court has approved the blanket protective order to facilitate discovery exchanges. But
27 **there has been no showing, and the Court has not found, that any specific documents are**
28 **secret or confidential.** The parties have not provided specific facts supported by declarations or

1 concrete examples to establish that a protective order is required to protect any specific trade secret
2 or other confidential information pursuant to Rule 26(c) or that disclosure would cause an
3 identifiable and significant harm. The Ninth Circuit has held that there is a presumption of public
4 access to judicial files and records, and that parties seeking to maintain the confidentiality of
5 documents attached to nondispositive motions must show good cause exists to overcome the
6 presumption of public access. *See Kamakana* 447 F.3d at 1179. Parties seeking to maintain the
7 secrecy of documents attached to dispositive motions must show compelling reasons sufficient to
8 overcome the presumption of public access. *Id.* at 1180. **All motions to seal must address the**
9 **applicable standard and explain why that standard has been met.** The fact that a court has
10 entered a blanket stipulated protective order and that a party has designated a document as
11 confidential pursuant to that protective order does not, standing alone, establish sufficient grounds
12 to seal a filed document. *See Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1133 (9th
13 Cir. 2003); *see also Beckman Indus., Inc. v. Int'l Ins. Co.*, 966 F.2d 470, 476 (9th Cir. 1992).

14 If the sole ground for a motion to seal is that the opposing party (or non-party) has
15 designated a document as confidential, the designator shall file (within seven days of the filing of
16 the motion to seal) either (1) a declaration establishing sufficient justification for sealing each
17 document at issue or (2) a notice of withdrawal of the designation(s) and consent to unsealing. If
18 neither filing is made, the Court may order the document(s) unsealed without further notice.

19 **IT IS ORDERED** that counsel shall comply with the requirements of Local Rule IA 10-
20 5, the Ninth Circuit's decision in *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d 1172, and the procedures outlined above,
21 with respect to any documents filed under seal. **To the extent any aspect of the stipulated protective**
22 **order may conflict with this order or Local Rule IA 10-5, that aspect of the stipulated protective**
23 **order is hereby superseded with this order.**

24 IT IS SO ORDERED.

25 Dated: September 12, 2019

26
27 
28 Nancy J. Koppe
United States Magistrate Judge